



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,719	02/16/2001	Dale W. Russell	CML00012H	4258

22917 7590 06/28/2005

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD
IL01/3RD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,719

Applicant(s)

RUSSELL, DALE W.

Examiner

Thomas E. Shortledge

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/17/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 10-12, 14-25, 27-37, 39-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 26, 38 and 54 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Remarks filed 02/17/2005.
2. Claims 1-5 and 10-58 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 18, 30, and 43 are independent.
3. Claims 6-9 have been cancelled and rewritten as independent claim 43, and dependent claims 44-46. Dependent claims 47-58 correspond to original claims 2-5 and 10-17 rewritten to be dependent on newly presented independent claim 43.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 and 10-58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 13, 26, 38 and 54 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 13, 26, 38 and 54 discuss:

creating grammar rules for at least one atomic value of the simple attribute;
adding said grammar rules for at least one atomic value to said new grammar;
creating grammar rules requiring the name of the object including the simple attributes and the atomic value of the attribute; and
adding said grammar rules created to said new grammar.

The prior art of record teach creating grammar rules based on attributes, requiring the name of the object, and adding the grammar rule to the grammar.

However, they do not teach nor fairly suggest the atomic values of the simple attribute, adding atomic value grammar rules to the new grammar, no of simple attributes and the atomic value of the domain attribute.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2654

7. Claims 1,2,10-12,14,18,19,25,30,31 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. (4,980,829) in view of Gavalda et al. (Growing Semantic Grammars).

As to claims 1, Okajima et al. teach:

a method of creating a grammar for a natural language dialog system from a domain model, (establishing a set of grammar rules for a machine translation system, from a domain, (col. 4, lines 23-25). "Dialog System" has not been given patentable weight because nothing specifically pertaining to dialogic interaction between user and computer has been claimed);

creating a new grammar from instances of general purpose grammar rules as a new grammar, said general purpose grammar rules including a plurality of selected objects, each of said objects including one or more (components of the text) attributes, (establishing sets of grammar rules, with objects of the text, where each object is made up of pairs or components of the text, col. 4, lines 23-27);

creating a query level umbrella rule for each broad category of queries in said general purpose grammar rules (a grammar file containing the rules that are related based on their dependence of the domains of the text, col. 4, lines 54-56);

selectively including the objects as domain objects in said new grammar (including objects based on the domains selected by the grammar rules, col. 4, lines 25-27); and

selectively including the one or more attributes in said new grammar (components of the text are included based on the domain and objects used, col. 4, lines 25-27).

Okajima et al. do not teach:

a natural language dialog system; nor

creating at least one domain object level umbrella rule for the one or more attributes.

However, Gavalda et al. teach:

a natural language dialog system (natural language understanding modules, col. 1, page 451.

creating at least one domain object level umbrella rule for the one or more attributes (creating layers of rules from the Domain Model, page 452).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the method of creating layers of rules of Gavalda et al. to rapidly create NLU modules for new domains, as taught by Gavalda et al. (col. 2, page 451).

As to claim 18, Okajima et al. teach:

creating instances of general purpose grammar rules as a new grammar, said general purpose grammar rules including a plurality of selected objects, each of said objects including one or more (components of the text) attributes, (establishing sets of

Art Unit: 2654

grammar rules, with objects of the text, where each object is made up of pairs or components of the text, col. 4, lines 23-27);

creating a query levelumbrella rule for each broad category of queries in said general purpose grammar rules (a grammar file containing the rules that are related based on their dependence of the domains of the text, col. 4, lines 54-56);

selectively including objects as domain objects in said new grammar (including objects based on the domains selected by the grammar rules, col. 4, lines 25-27);

selectively including attributes in said new grammar (components of the text are included based on the domain and objects used, col. 4, lines 25-27)

detecting and repairing inconsistencies in said new grammar (reducing the number of rules used to the absolute minimum, col. 7, lines 25-27. It would be inherent that reducing the number of rules would include detecting and repairing inconsistencies in the new grammar.).

Okajima et al. do not teach:

a natural language dialog system; nor

However, Gavalda et al. teach:

a natural language dialog system (natural language understanding modules, col. 1, page 451.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. to rapidly create NLU modules for new domains, as taught by Gavalda et al. (col. 2, page 451).

As to claim 30, Okajima et al. teach:

a computer program product for creating a natural language dialog grammar from a domain model, comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program thereon (a machine translation system is equipped with control means for establishing sets of grammar rules (col. 4, lines 23-27). The machine translation system is made up of a memory storing a variety of information and a central processing unit (col. 4, lines 50-52). It would be inherent that a computer program would be used to communicate between the processor and the memory).

forming a new grammar including instances of general purpose grammar rules, said instances of general purpose rules being a plurality of objects, each of said objects including one or more attributes (establishing sets of grammar rules, with objects of the text, where each object is made up of pairs or components of the text, col. 4, lines 23-27);

creating query level umbrella rules for query categories and for attributes (a grammar file containing the rules that are related based on their dependence of the domains of the text and the parts of the text, col. 4, lines 54-56);

selecting objects and attributes included as domain objects and domain object attributes in said new grammar (including objects based on the domains selected by the grammar rules, (col. 4, lines 25-27), and components of the text are included based on the domain and objects used, col. 4, lines 25-27);

Okajima et al. do not teach:

Art Unit: 2654

a natural language dialog system; nor

However, Gavalda et al. teach:

a natural language dialog system (natural language understanding modules, col. 1, page 451.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. to rapidly create NLU modules for new domains, as taught by Gavalda et al. (col. 2, page 451).

As to claims 2, 19, and 31, Okajima et al. teach:

creating an initially empty new grammar (establishing a set of grammar rules based on the dependence of the input, col. 4, lines 23-28);

opening a template grammar (pattern), said template grammar including parameterized general purpose rules to be instantiated (the pattern contains the rules and domain designating the area of the unit to be translated, col. 6, lines 15-18);

creating instances of said general purpose rules (the selected domain (col. 6, lines 9-10) that contain the rules to recognize the type and style of the characters within the defined pattern, col. 6 lines 23-27);

adding the instantiated general purpose rules to said initially empty new grammar (storing sets of grammar rules depending on the domains of the text to be translated, col. 4, lines 55-56. The domain contain the rules to recognize the type and style of the

Art Unit: 2654

characters of the defined pattern, (col. 6, lines 15-18). It would be necessary that before any sets of grammar rules are stored, the grammar would be initially empty).

As to claims 10, and 25, Okajima et al. teach the developer selects whether at least one of the attributes is included in the new grammar (the information of sentence attributes may be designated by the user, col. 7, lines 12-15).

As to claim 11, Okajima et al. teach:

including attribute name grammar rules naming the attributes selected by the developer (attributes are named by the code part within col. 426, fig. 8, and how they are relating to fig. 7)

identifying whether each attribute selected by the developer is complex or simple (able to find if a word or part of a sentence has more than one meaning (col. 9, lines 25-35). If the word has more than one meaning it would be inherently complex, versus a single meaning, making that word or part of a sentence simple).

As to claim 12, Okajima et al. teach:

creating grammar rules relating the object including said complex attribute to a (part of speech or utterance) subsidiary domain object, (environment information denotes which meaning of the word to use, col. 9, lines 20-29).

adding said grammar rules to said new grammar (The environment information would be inherently added to the grammar, to disambiguate future uses of the word).

As to claims 14 and 39, Okajima et al. teach detecting and repairing inconsistencies in the new grammar (reducing the number of rules used to the absolute minimum, col. 7, lines 25-27. It would be inherent that reducing the number of rules would include detecting and repairing inconsistencies in the new grammar).

8. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. in view of Gavalda et al. and in further view of Monaco (6,434,523).

As to claims 43, Okajima et al. teach:

a method of creating a grammar for a natural language dialog system from a domain model, (establishing a set of grammar rules for a machine translation system, from a domain, (col. 4, lines 23-25). "Dialog System" has not been given patentable weight because nothing specifically pertaining to dialogic interaction between user and computer has been claimed);

creating a new grammar from instances of general purpose grammar rules as a new grammar, said general purpose grammar rules including a plurality of selected objects, each of said objects including one or more (components of the text) attributes, (establishing sets of grammar rules, with objects of the text, where each object is made up of pairs or components of the text, col. 4, lines 23-27);

Art Unit: 2654

creating a query level umbrella rule for each broad category of queries in said general purpose grammar rules (a grammar file containing the rules that are related based on their dependence of the domains of the text, col. 4, lines 54-56);

selectively including the objects as domain objects in said new grammar (including objects based on the domains selected by the grammar rules, col. 4, lines 25-27);

selecting an object from said plurality of objects (column 425 of fig. 8 contains the objects of the pattern that may be selected); and
selectively including the one or more attributes in said new grammar (components of the text are included based on the domain and objects used, col. 4, lines 25-27).

Okajima et al. do not teach:

a natural language dialog system;

creating at least one domain object level umbrella rule for the one or more attributes; nor

presenting said selected object to a developer, said developer deciding whether said object is included in said new grammar.

However, Gavalda et al. teach:

a natural language dialog system (natural language understanding modules, col. 1, page 451.

creating at least one domain object level umbrella rule for the one or more attributes (creating layers of rules from the Domain Model, page 452).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the method of creating layers of rules of Gavalda et al. to rapidly create NLU modules for new domains, as taught by Gavalda et al. (col. 2, page 451).

Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach presenting said selected object to a developer, said developer deciding whether said object is included in said new grammar.

However, Monaco teaches presenting said selected object to a developer, said developer deciding whether said object is included in said new grammar (the user is able to control the process of adding a deleting objects from the set of objects, col. 3, lines 65-67)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the method of creating layers of rules of Gavalda et al and with the user selectivity of Monaco to increase to increase the ability for speech grammars to be created quickly and easily, as taught by Monaco, (col. 1, lines 67 and col. 2, lines 1).

9. Claims 3-5, 20, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. in view of Gavalda et al. as in claims 1, 19, and 31 above and in further view of Eberman et al. (5,805,775).

As to claim 3, Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach each said query level umbrella rule includes a domain-object-independent non-terminal (non-terminal

Art Unit: 2654

symbol) in a left-hand side and a set of expansions of said non-terminal in a right-hand side.

However, Eberman et al. teach a rule with a left-hand side and a right-hand side. The left-hand side includes a non-terminal symbol associated with an _expression, and the right-hand side contains a sub-string associated with a variable of the non-terminal symbol (col. 4 lines 50-54, 67-69, and col. 5, lines 1-9). The non-terminal symbol of the left-hand side is domain-object-independent because it can be shared among numerous applications, allowing to be non-domain specific, col. 5, lines 17-23).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the rule definition of Eberman et al. to create a set of grammar rules to be shared among many applications as taught by Eberman et al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

As to claim 4, Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach each of said set of non-terminal expansions is a domain-specific instantiation of the broad category.

However, Eberman et al. teach a right-hand rule containing a non-terminal symbol associated with a variable or an _expression, where they represent instances of the input text (col. 5, lines 5-6, and 62-65). The non-terminal symbol is domain specific when it is marked private, and only relates to one set of application rules, col. 5, lines 15-17).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the rule definition of Eberman et al. to create a set of grammar rules to be shared among many applications as taught by Eberman et al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

As to claim 5, Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach the domain-object-independent non-terminal relates the query level umbrella rule to a broad category of rules.

However, Eberman et al. teach a left-hand side of a rule that contains expressions that relate the rule to the chose base interpretive evaluation language (col. 4, lines 67-68, and col. 5, lines 1-3)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the rule definition of Eberman et al. to create a set of grammar rules to be shared among many applications as taught by Eberman et al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

As to claim 20, Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach creating query level umbrella rules creates a rule with a left-hand side being a domain-object-independent non-terminal and a right-hand side including a set of expansions of said non-terminal, each of said set of non-terminal expansions being a domain specific

Art Unit: 2654

instantiation of the broad category, said non-terminal relating the rule to a broad category of rules.

However, Eberman et al. teach:

creating query level umbrella rules creates a rule with a left-hand side being a domain-object-independent non-terminal and a right-hand side including a set of expansions of said non-terminal (a rule with a left-hand side and a right-hand side. The left-hand side includes a non-terminal symbol associated with an _expression, and the right-hand side contains a sub-string associated with a variable of the non-terminal symbol, (col. 4 lines 50-54, 67-69, and col. 5, lines 1-9). The non-terminal symbol of the left-hand side is domain-object-independent because it can be shared among numerous applications, allowing to be non-domain specific, col. 5, lines 17-23).;

each of set of non-terminal expansions being a domain-specific instantiation of the broad category (a right-hand rule containing a non-terminal symbol associated with a variable or an _expression, where they represent instances of the input text, col. 5, lines 5-6, and 62-65). The non-terminal symbol is domain specific when it is marked private, and only relates to one set of application rules, col. 5, lines 15-17).;

non-terminal relating the rule to a broad category of rules (a left-hand side of a rule that contains expressions that relate the rule to the chose base interpretive evaluation language, col. 4, lines 67-68, and col. 5, lines 1-3).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the rule definition of Eberman et al. to

create a set of grammar rules to be shared among many applications as taught by Eberman et al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

As to claim 32, Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach creating query level umbrella rules creates a rule with a left-hand side being a domain-object-independent non-terminal and a right-hand side including a set of expansions of said non-terminal, each of said set of non-terminal expansions being a domain specific instantiation of the broad category, said non-terminal relating the rule to a broad category of rules.

However, Eberman et al. teach:

creating umbrella rules creates a rule with a left-hand side being a domain-object-independent non-terminal and a right-hand side including a set of expansions of said non-terminal (a rule with a left-hand side and a right-hand side. The left-hand side includes a non-terminal symbol associated with an _expression, and the right-hand side contains a sub-string associated with a variable of the non-terminal symbol, (col. 4 lines 50-54, 67-69, and col. 5, lines 1-9). The non-terminal symbol of the left-hand side is domain-object-independent because it can be shared among numerous applications, allowing to be non-domain specific, col. 5, lines 17-23).;

each of set of non-terminal expansions being a domain-specific instantiation of the broad category (a right-hand rule containing a non-terminal symbol associated with a variable or an _expression, where they represent instances of the input text, col. 5,

Art Unit: 2654

lines 5-6, and 62-65). The non-terminal symbol is domain specific when it is marked private, and only relates to one set of application rules, col. 5, lines 15-17).;

non-terminal relating the rule to a broad category of rules (a left-hand side of a rule that contains expressions that relate the rule to the chose base interpretive evaluation language, col. 4, lines 67-68, and col. 5, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the rule definition of Eberman et al. to create a set of grammar rules to be shared among many applications as taught by Eberman et al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

10. Claims 21-24 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. in view of Gavalda et al. as in claims 1, 18, and 43 above, and in view of Monaco (6,434,523).

As to claim 21, Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach:

teach selecting selected objects;

presenting said selected object to a developer, said developer deciding whether said presented selected object is included in said new grammar.

However, Monaco teaches:

teach selecting selected objects; (selecting the included objects by adding or deleting the objects from a set of objects, col. 3, lines 65-67); and

presenting said selected object to a developer, said developer deciding whether said presented selected object is included in said new grammar (the user is able to control the process of adding a deleting objects from the set of objects, col. 3, lines 65-67)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the user selectivity of Monaco to increase to increase the ability for speech grammars to be created quickly and easily, as taught by Monaco, (col. 1, lines 67 and col. 2, lines 1).

As to claims 22 and 44, Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach:

creating a domain object level umbrella rule for each broad category of object phrases;

creating an object name grammar rule the domain object level for each created umbrella rule;

allowing the developer to select names for the included object, nor,

adding entries in said new grammar for each selected name

However Monaco teaches:

creating a domain object level umbrella rule for each broad category of object phrases (the user can combine many objects into one object, which allows the rules of the many objects to be merged into one larger rule, (col. 9, lines 50-55). The created

larger rule is obviously an umbrella rule as it contains all the rules of the combined objects, and larger rule is able to represent the other rules);

creating an object name grammar rule the domain object level for each created umbrella rule (the graphical object generator provides graphical representations of the objects, and the connections between the objects, it may also create objects to represent expressions, col. 6, lines 16-20, and 26-31);

allowing the developer to select names for the included object (the user may enter text to specify a GSL listing representing a grammar, col. 8, lines 1-4)

adding entries in said new grammar for each selected name (the user can add objects to the grammar, adding them to different areas within the grammar, col. 9, lines 64-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the user selectivity of Monaco to increase to increase the ability for speech grammars to be created quickly and easily, as taught by Monaco, (col. 1, lines 67 and col. 2, lines 1).

As to claims 23 and 45, Okajima et al. teach the object name grammar rules created further includes an object name possessive rule, said object name possessive rule specifying the possessive form of the name of said object, (col. 425 of fig. 8 depicts the objects, where the code listed is related to fig. 7, where the code depicts the information contained within the object).

As to claims 24 and 46, Okajima et al. teach:

specializing object rules not requiring developer input (the information relating to the object, domain and part can be automatically determined, col. 7, lines 12-15);

specializing query rules requiring only the name of the domain object (col. 425, of fig. 8 depicts the objects, where the code listed is related to fig. 7, where the name of the domain object is listed).

11. Claims 15-17, and 27-29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. as applied to claim 14 and 18 above in view of Mohri et al. (6,243,679), and claims 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al, Gavalda et al. and Monaco as applied to claim 43 above in view of Mohri et al.

As to claims 15, 27 and 56, Okajima et al. teach creating a new grammar (col. 4, lines 24):

Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach:

running a grammar checker on a grammar, said grammar checker identifying unreachable non-terminals;

repairing the new grammar to eliminate identified unreachable non-terminals thereby creating a repaired new grammar;

running said grammar checker on said repaired new grammar, said grammar checker identifying non-terminating expressions; nor repairing said repaired grammar to eliminate identified non-terminating expansions.

However, Mohri et al. teach:

running a grammar checker on a grammar, said grammar checker identifying unreachable non-terminals (a program to trim a set of states within a string to weight transducer. Includes removing those that are unreachable from initial states (col. 7, lines 30-32), this process would necessarily include identifying the unreachable states first. These transducers are used to model languages and word lattices, it would be necessary that they would also be used to model grammars, col. 5, lines 4-5);

repairing the new grammar to eliminate identified unreachable non-terminals thereby creating a repaired new grammar (trimming a set of states includes removing those that are unreachable from initial states col. 7, lines 30-32);

running said grammar checker on said repaired new grammar, said grammar checker identifying non-terminating expressions (removing the non-coaccessible states, those which admit no path to a final state, (col. 7, lines 30-33). It would be obvious that first the non-accessible states would be removed, then after those are repaired within the grammar, the non-coaccessible states are removed.); and

repairing said repaired grammar to eliminate identified non-terminating expansions (trimming a set of states includes removing those that are non-coaccessible states, those which admit no path to a final state, col. 7, lines 30-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the state trimming of Mohri et al. to create the smallest automata (or grammar) without loss of information or capabilities, as taught by Mohri et al. (col. 2, lines 9-12).

As to claims 16, 28 and 57, Okajima et al. teach prompting the developer (the user is able to provide a strategy, setting the rules to be used, col. 9, lines 55-60).

Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach:

deleting unreachable non-terminals; and

adding new rules to make all remaining non-terminals reachable.

However Mohri et al. teach:

deleting unreachable non-terminals (col. 7, lines 30-32)

adding new rules to make all remaining non-terminals reachable (removing non-terminals from the set of states (col. 7, lines 30-32), and since τ_1 is traversable after the non-terminals are removed, it would be necessary that the remaining non-terminals were reachable).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation and user interaction of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the state trimming of Mohri et al. to create the smallest automata (or grammar) without loss of information or capabilities, as taught by Mohri et al. (col. 2, lines 9-12).

As to claims 17, 29 and 58, Okajima et al. teach prompting the developer (the user is asked to provide a strategy, setting the rules to be used, col. 9, lines 55-60).

Okajima et al. and Gavalda et al. do not teach:

deleting identified non-terminating expansions; nor

adding rules terminating all remaining said non-terminating expansions.

However, Mohri et al. teach:

deleting identified non-terminating expansions (trimming to remove all non-coaccessible state, which are those that admit no path to the final state, col. 7, lines 30-33).

adding rules terminating all remaining said non-terminating expressions (trimming to remove all non-coaccessible state, (col. 7, lines 30-33), and since τ_1 is traversable after the non-coaccessible states are removed, it would be necessary that the remaining non-coaccessible states were terminated).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. and with the state trimming of Mohri et al. to create the smallest automata (or grammar) without loss of information or capabilities, as taught by Mohri et al. (col. 2, lines 9-12).

Art Unit: 2654

12. Claims 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. in view of Gavalda et al. and in view of Eberman et al. as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Monaco.

As to claim 33, Okajima et al. Gavalda et al. and Eberman et al. do not teach:
selecting selected objects; nor
presenting said selected object to a developer, said developer deciding whether said presented selected object is included in said new grammar.

However, Monaco teaches:
selecting selected objects (selecting the included objects by adding or deleting the objects from a set of objects, col. 3, lines 65-67); and
presenting said selected object to a developer, said developer deciding whether said presented selected object is included in said new grammar (the user is able to control the process of adding a deleting objects from the set of objects, col. 3, liens 65-67)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. with the computer program of Eberman et al. and with the user selectivity of Monaco to increase to increase the ability for speech grammars to be created quickly and easily, as taught by Monaco, (col. 1, lines 67 and col. 2, lines 1).

As to claim 34, Okajima et al, Gavalda et al. and Eberman et al. do not teach presenting said attributes to a developer, said developer deciding whether each of said presented attributes is included in said new grammar

However, Monaco teaches the user has the ability to add selected alternative expressions to the objects, (col. 9, lines 46-48).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al, with the computer program of Eberman et al. and with the user selectivity of Monaco to increase to increase the ability for speech grammars to be created quickly and easily, as taught by Monaco, (col. 1, lines 67 and col. 2, lines 1).

As to claim 35, Okajima et al, Gavalda et al. and Eberman et al. do not teach:
creating object name grammar rules for at least one domain level umbrella rule;
receiving a name selection from a developer, said name selection selectively including said object name created by computer responsive to creating said object name grammar rules; nor

entering names in said new grammar responsive to selection by said developer.

However Monaco teaches:

creating object name grammar rules for umbrella rules (the graphical object generator provides graphical representations of the objects, and the connections between the objects, it may also create objects to represent expressions, col. 6, lines 16-20, and 26-31);

Art Unit: 2654

receiving a name selection from a developer, said name selection selectively including said object name created by computer responsive to creating said object name grammar rules (the user may enter text to specify a GSL listing representing a grammar, col. 8, lines 1-4); and

entering names in said new grammar responsive to selection by said developer (the user can add objects to the grammar, adding them to different areas within the grammar, col. 9, lines 64-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al, with the computer program of Eberman et al. and with the user selectivity of Monaco to increase to increase the ability for speech grammars to be created quickly and easily, as taught by Monaco, (col. 1, lines 67 and col. 2, lines 1).

As to claim 36, Okajima et al. teach the object name grammar rules created further includes an object name possessive rule, said object name possessive rule specifying the possessive form of the name of said object (col. 425 of fig. 8 depicts the objects, where the code listed is related to fig. 7, where the code depicts the information contained within the object. Since the code depicts the information contained within the object, the name used would obviously be the possessive of the object).

As to claim 37, Okajima et al. teach:

automatically specializing object rules (the information relating to the object, domain and part can be automatically determined, col. 7, lines 12-15);and

specializing query rules requiring only the name of the domain object (col. 425, of fig. 8 depicts the objects, where the code listed is related to fig. 7, where the name of the domain object is listed).

13. Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. in view of Gavalda et al. in view of Eberman et al. as applied to claim 39 above, and further in view of Mohri et al.

As to claim 40, Okajima et al, Gavalda et al. and Eberman et al. do not teach:

identifying unreachable non-terminals;

eliminating identified unreachable non-terminals;

identifying non-terminating expressions; nor

eliminating identified non-terminating expansions.

However, Mohri et al. teach:

identifying unreachable non-terminals (trimming a set of states within a string to weight transducer. Includes removing those that are unreachable from initial states (col. 7, lines 30-32), this process would necessarily include identifying the unreachable states first. These transducers are used to model languages and word lattices, it would be necessary that they would also be used to model grammars, col. 5, lines 4-5);

eliminating identified unreachable non-terminals (trimming a set of states includes removing those that are unreachable from initial states col. 7, lines 30-32);

identifying non-terminating expressions (trimming a set of states includes removing those that are non-coaccessible states, those which admit no path to a final state, (col. 7, lines 30-33), this process would necessarily include identifying the non-terminating expressions before they are removed.); and

eliminating identified non-terminating expansions (trimming a set of states includes removing those that are non-coaccessible states, those which admit no path to a final state, col. 7, lines 30-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al, with the computer program of Eberman et al. and with the state trimming of Mohri et al. to create the smallest automata (or grammar) without loss of information or capabilities, as taught by Mohri et al. (col. 2, lines 9-12).

As to claim 41, Okajima et al, Gavalda et al. and Eberman et al. do not teach
Selectively deleting identified unreachable non-terminals; nor
Selectively adding new rules making identified unreachable non-terminals
reachable.

However Mohri et al. teach:

selectively deleting identified unreachable non-terminals (col. 7, lines 30-32)

selectively adding new rules making identified unreachable non-terminals reachable (removing non-terminals from the set of states (col. 7, lines 30-32), and since τ_1 is traversable after the non-terminals are removed, it would be necessary that the remaining non-terminals were reachable).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. with the computer program of Eberman et al. and with the state trimming of Mohri et al. to create the smallest automata (or grammar) without loss of information or capabilities, as taught by Mohri et al. (col. 2, lines 9-12).

As to claim 42, Okajima et al. Gavalda et al. and Eberman et al. do not teach:
selectively deleting identified non-terminating expansions; nor
selectively adding rules terminating identified non-terminating expressions.

However Mohri et al. teach

selectively deleting identified non-terminating expansions (trimming to remove all non-coaccessible state, which are those that admit no path to the final state, col. 7, lines 30-33).

selectively adding rules terminating identified non-terminating expressions (trimming to remove all non-coaccessible state, (col. 7, lines 30-33). and since τ_1 is traversable after the non-coaccessible states are removed, it would be necessary that the remaining non-coaccessible states were terminated).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation method of Okajima et al. with the natural language dialog system Gavalda et al. with the computer program of Eberman et al. and with the state trimming of Mohri et al. to create the smallest automata (or grammar) without loss of information or capabilities, as taught by Mohri et al. (col. 2, lines 9-12).

14. Claims 47, 51-53 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. in view of Gavalda et al. and in view of Monaco as applied to claim 44 above.

As to claim 47, Okajima et al. teach:

creating an initially empty new grammar (establishing a set of grammar rules based on the dependence of the input, col. 4, lines 23-28);

opening a template grammar (pattern), said template grammar including parameterized general purpose rules to be instantiated (the pattern contains the rules and domain designating the area of the unit to be translated, col. 6, lines 15-18);

creating instances of said general purpose rules (the selected domain (col. 6, lines 9-10) that contain the rules to recognize the type and style of the characters within the defined pattern, col. 6 lines 23-27);

adding the instantiated general purpose rules to said initially empty new grammar (storing sets of grammar rules depending on the domains of the text to be translated,

Art Unit: 2654

col. 4, lines 55-56. The domain contain the rules to recognize the type and style of the characters of the defined pattern, (col. 6, lines 15-18). It would be necessary that before any sets of grammar rules are stored, the grammar would be initially empty).

As to claim 51, Okajima et al. teach the developer selects whether at least one of the attributes is included in the new grammar (the information of sentence attributes may be designated by the user, col. 7, lines 12-15).

As to claim 52, Okajima et al. teach:

including attribute name grammar rules naming the attributes selected by the developer (attributes are named by the code part within col. 426, fig. 8, and how they are relating to fig. 7)

identifying whether each attribute selected by the developer is complex or simple (able to find if a word or part of a sentence has more than one meaning (col. 9, lines 25-35). If the word has more than one meaning it would be inherently complex, versus a single meaning, making that word or part of a sentence simple).

As to claim 53, Okajima et al. teach:

creating grammar rules relating the object including said complex attribute to a (part of speech or utterance) subsidiary domain object, (environment information denotes which meaning of the word to use, col. 9, lines 20-29).

adding said grammar rules to said new grammar (The environment information would be inherently added to the grammar, to disambiguate future uses of the word).

As to claim 55, Okajima et al. teach detecting and repairing inconsistencies in the new grammar (reducing the number of rules used to the absolute minimum, col. 7, lines 25-27. It would be inherent that reducing the number of rules would include detecting and repairing inconsistencies in the new grammar).

15. Claims 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. in view of Gavalda et al. and in view of Monaco as applied to claim 44 above in further view of Eberman et al.

As to claim 48, Okajima et al, Gavalda et al. and Monaco do not teach each said query level umbrella rule includes a domain-object-independent non-terminal (non-terminal symbol) in a left-hand side and a set of expansions of said non-terminal in a right-hand side.

However, Eberman et al. teach a rule with a left-hand side and a right-hand side. The left-hand side includes a non-terminal symbol associated with an expression, and the right-hand side contains a sub-string associated with a variable of the non-terminal symbol (col. 4 lines 50-54, 67-69, and col. 5, lines 1-9). The non-terminal symbol of the

Art Unit: 2654

left-hand side is domain-object-independent because it can be shared among numerous applications, allowing to be non-domain specific, col. 5, lines 17-23).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the method of creating layers of rules of Gavalda et al and with the user selectivity of Monaco and with the rule definition of Eberman et al. to create a set of grammar rules to be shared among many applications as taught by Eberman et al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

As to claim 49, Okajima et al, Gavalda et al. and Monaco do not teach each of said set of non-terminal expansions is a domain-specific instantiation of the broad category.

However, Eberman et al. teach a right-hand rule containing a non-terminal symbol associated with a variable or an expression, where they represent instances of the input text (col. 5, lines 5-6, and 62-65). The non-terminal symbol is domain specific when it is marked private, and only relates to one set of application rules, col. 5, lines 15-17).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the method of creating layers of rules of Gavalda et al and with the user selectivity of Monaco and with the rule definition of Eberman et al. to create a set of grammar rules to be shared among many applications as taught by Eberman et al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

As to claim 50, Okajima et al, Gavalda et al. and Monaco do not teach the domain-object-independent non-terminal relates the query level umbrella rule to a broad category of rules.

However, Eberman et al. teach a left-hand side of a rule that contains expressions that relate the rule to the chose base interpretive evaluation language (col. 4, lines 67-68, and col. 5, lines 1-3)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the grammar creation of Okajima et al. with the method of creating layers of rules of Gavalda et al and with the user selectivity of Monaco and with the rule definition of Eberman et al. to create a set of grammar rules to be shared among many applications as taught by Eberman et al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2654

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
6/23/2005

Vijay Chawan
VIJAY CHAWAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER